may disappear, but there is no proof that world-
existence is an evanescent phenomenon: on the
contrary, we may suppose that the power of
manifestation is inherent in Brahman and continues
to act either continuously in Time-eternity or in
an eternal recurrence. The cosmic is a different
order of the Real from the su^racosmic Transcend-
ence, but there is no need to take it as .in any way
non-existent or unreal to that Transcendence. For
the purely intellectual conception that only the
Eternal is real, whether we take it in the sense
that reality depends on perpetual duration or that-
the timeless only is true, is an ideative distinction,.
a mental construction; it is not binding on a
substantial and integral experience. Time is not
necessarily cancelled out of existence by timeless
Eternity; their relation is only verbally a relation of
contradiction; in fact, it is more likely to be a
relation of dependence.

Similarly, the reasoning which cancels the
dynamics of the Absolute, the imposition of
the stigma of unreal reality on the pragmatic
truth of things because it is pragmatic, is.
difficult to accept; for the pragmatic truth is after
all not something quite other, quite separate and

unconnected with spiritual truth, it is a result of
the energy or a motion of the dynamic activity of
the Spirit. A distinction must, no doubt, be made-
between the two, but the idea of an entire opposition
can rest only on the postulate that a silent and
quiescent status is the Eternal's true and whole